DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 184 HE 011 711

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.
TITLE Robots or Reinsmen: Job Opportunities and Professional Standing for Collegiate Administrators in the 1980's. ASHE Annual Meeting 1979 Paper.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Washington, D.C., April 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Role; *College Administration; Higher Education; Leadership; *Middle Management; Occupational Mobility; *Power Structure; Professional Continuing Education; Professional Development; Speeches; *Staff Improvement; *Talent Development; Talent Utilization
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting 1979

ABSTRACT

Which model provides a more accurate picture of future job responsibilities and professional standing for middle-level administrators in colleges and universities: the robot, or the reinsman who has ability, courage, and control but stays in the background? Competing forces are described in this speech: the institution's desire for stability and the administrator's desire for challenges and the full use of his ability. Role conflicts and role confusion can undermine administrative effectiveness. Given these limitations and the probable failure to develop a new purpose, the form, processes, and practices of higher education will probably not change appreciably in the foreseeable future; but there will be changes in college administration. New clientele will require new services, and new public policies and patterns of attendance may lead us to expect a reduction in some current services. There is a tendency toward bureaucratization and centralization as a survival mechanism. The effects will be continued demands on the senior officers and governing bodies of institutions, and an increasing need for administrative help. Colleges and universities should become the pacemakers in developing new models of mobility and advancement. Organizations should and can be flexible and give as much attention to the talents and interests of gifted staff as to the functions to be carried out. The reinsman, with his authority, reflexes, and independence, is a model for collegiate administrators to follow. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174184

ROBOTS OR REINSMEN

Job Opportunities and Professional Standing for Collegiate Administrators in the 1980's

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Robert A. Scott
Cornell University

Lecture presented at the National Assembly of the American Association for Higher Education
April 17, 1979, Washington, D.C.

HE011711

Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Washington Hilton in Washington, D.C. April 18-19, 1979. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Robots or Reinsmen: Job Opportunities and Professional Standing for Collegiate Administrators in the 1980's

Robert A. Scott
Cornell University

Lyman Glenny has referred to middle-level collegiate administrators as "anonymous leaders" (Glenny, 1972). They have also been called Lords, Squires, and Yeomen because of their limited mobility in a highly stratified hierarchical setting (Scott, 1978).

Because collegiate middle-managers evoke such a variety of terms, and because their future prospects for job opportunities and professional standing appear so mixed, I have attempted to capture this uncertain status in a new choice of metaphors: robots and reinsmen.

Robots, of course, are a popular image for programmed behavior of modest flexibility. The picture we have is of a stiff, squat, R2D2-like character who works diligently at his assigned duties, but has limited capabilities. He can calculate data quickly, but manipulate only what has been programmed.

A reinsman, however--I could not bring myself to add reinsperson to the ranks of Norseperson--conveys the image of one who has great ability and courage,

but stays in the background. He, or she, is the anonymous or unsung hero; attention is focused on others in life and on the movie screen.

The stagecoach reinsman had many duties to perform almost simultaneously. He developed his skills in an environment that required quick and continual change; he learned to deal calmly with the unexpected (Wrapp, 1979). The reinsman had to avoid the hazards of potholes and enemies, be alert to the condition of his charges, and consider the security and destination of his passengers; he had to keep to a schedule no matter what surprises occurred in his path. The robot, by way of contrast, operates in a highly controlled environment.

Which of these models provides a more accurate picture of future job responsibilities and professional standing for mid-level administrators in colleges and universities? This is the matter on which I wish to speculate. Using data on collegiate middle-managers and employment compiled during a 1977-78 study sponsored by the Exxon Education Foundation, and more recent data gleaned from a variety of literature sources, I will attempt, in Nisbet's terms, to offer portraits of college administrators against the social landscape that is only now coming into view.

The perspective with which I have studied these questions is that of the social anthropologist. During my Exxon study, part of which is reported in the recent ERIC monograph entitled Lords, Squires, and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle-Managers and Their Organizations (Scott, ibid.), I spent from one to five days at each of twenty institutions which varied in size and character. I studied middle-managers in their offices, looked for the discontinuities between expressed goals and actual behavior, examined how basic organizational problems were solved, and analyzed on site and by intensive questionnaire the socio-cultural context of collegiate middle-management. With this as background, I have studied projections of enrollment, faculty employment, and current fund expenditures, and have considered the difficulties that are said to be before us. What do they mean--as far as job opportunities and professional standing are concerned--for college administrators?

First, we must suggest, by asking a variety of questions, the socio-cultural context of higher education in the future. What forces will be at work? What will be the effect on campus of inflation and changes in funding? What new organizational models may evolve because of the expression of new needs and changes in academic disciplines? Will colleges and universities become more cooperative or still more competitive? What changes can

we expect in faculty power? What will be the effects of extra-institutional forces on the ratios between students, faculty, and administrators?

There are obvious dangers in forecasting. As Howard Bowen said three years ago, "The best assumption to make about the future is that it will bring surprises" (1976). Yet there are some events and forces whose effects on postsecondary education during the next decade we can comment on with confidence. Others we can discuss with less certainty.

One apparent certainty is the decline in potential college students of traditional age. The 18-year-old freshmen of 1990 are now in grade school and they are fewer in number than we are accustomed to. There is, of course, the possibility of expanded access for women, minorities, low-income youth and adults, but this is much less certain than the decline in the total cohort of traditional freshmen. And we cannot predict with confidence the college-going rate of future students, or what alternative activities will become attractive. However, the world population is growing rapidly, with an increase of 50% expected by the year 2000 (Reinhold, 1979, p. D9). The most dramatic gains in population will be in the less developed countries, many of which are rich in natural resources but lacking in collegiate institutions. Perhaps

the students of these countries will help offset our demographic projections. This, too, is uncertain. So the one apparent likelihood we have is that for the first time in many decades, higher education in this country will not experience growth. I believe this simple and often cited fact is quite important because so many of our assumptions about institutions, admissions, curricula, staffing, teaching, and funding are based on growth. We need to consider new assumptions.

Other features of the socio-cultural context of higher education in the next decade include: the probable decline in faculty openings and the certain increase in average age of faculty; the known extension and the likely elimination of retirement age limits; the economic and social status of Black Americans and other minorities; military manpower needs during a period of declining enlistments, a reduction in number of eighteen to twenty-year olds and of college graduates, and an increasing emphasis on national security at a time of growing world tensions, when many newly developing countries have rapidly growing numbers of young people and substantial support for military service; the increase in governmental requirements for accountability in many areas of activity and the probable effects on organizational structures they will bring; the need to repair and replace portions

of the physical plant; the increasing intensity of interest groups organized around single issues, and the need for new mechanisms of conflict resolution; the tension between the need for greater centralization of authority on campus for institutional planning and decision-making--especially for quick responses to new developments--and the highly decentralized nature of most models of collegiate structure; the effects of state legislative programs and the actions, or lack of same, of the major foundations.

Additional features include the need, because of increased competition, to offer new services to attract and retain students; the problems of urban areas and the role of universities in serving society; increased collective bargaining in the face of rising insecurity of employment, salary increases below the rate of inflation, and lack of trust in centralized decision-making (Ladd and Lipset, 1975, p. 243 ff.; Riley and Baldridge, 1977, p. 99; Mortimer and McConnell, 1978, p. 49; Baldridge, et al., 1978, p. 99); the debate over tenure, which could be changed dramatically when and if a state legislature or other agency creates a substitute for it (Linney, 1979); trends toward bureaucratic structures and business models even in the traditional professions (Yarmolinsky, 1978);

the greater need for information and the pressures for certification and licensing in many areas of work; and changes in how people are admitted to professions, how professional services are offered, and how professional standards are defined and adjudicated (Yarmolinsky, op. cit. p. 171; Mosher and Wagoner, 1978, p. 306).

Still other features include increased emphasis on the evaluation of programs; the growing concern for the legal liability of trustees; an increased demand for work-study programs; and, of course, the cumulative effects of all of these features on the rights and obligations of students, faculty, officers, and trustees.

This series of possible events and issues suggests the many elements that shape the socio-cultural context of higher education. Our objective here was to sketch the first lines of the distant landscape. Now let us do the same with our portrait of collegiate middle-management.

Frederick Rudolph (1962) has reported on the development of college administration in the U.S. Before the Civil War, most colleges employed a president, a treasurer, and a part-time librarian, in addition to the faculty, to exercise responsibility in needed areas. After the War, college offices began to grow and splinter because of enrollment increases and demands for new services. First, a secretary of the faculty was appointed, then a registrar, and

> then in succession a vice-president, a dean, a dean of women, a chief business officer, an assistant dean, a dean of men, a director of admissions, and in time a corps of administrative assistants to the president who were in charge of anything and everything--[alumni and] public relations, church relations, civic relations, student relations, faculty relations (Rudolph, 1962, pp. 434-435).

Similar forces for growth and differentiation are at work now; let us examine them and their consequences for job opportunities.

By job opportunities I mean to include new categories of jobs, new levels of responsibility in existing job categories, and an increased number of jobs; career paths and mobility; salaries and annual increases; and the challenges of new problems and assignments. For years, these varied forms of job opportunity have been created in large part by enrollment growth; more students meant more institutions, more services to be provided, and more levels of administration. This growth in institutional size and complexity has resulted in the expansion, specialization, and differentiation of administrative jobs (Parsons and Platt, 1973).

According to a National Education Association (NEA) analysis of HEGIS (Higher Education General Information Survey) data, administrators accounted for one in five higher education positions in 1972-73 and one in four in 1976-77 (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1977, p. 7).

Even with the stable enrollments of recent years, the growth, specialization, and differentiation of administrative positions seem to have continued, especially at two-year and four-year colleges (Minter and Bowen, 1978, p. 28). The causes now are the intensified needs for data, donations, and students, and institutional responses to governmental requirements. This latter point, by the way, is examined in a Change Magazine Press book entitled, In the Public Interest: Government and the Future of the Academy (Scott, 1979).

But what about the future? If the projections of declining enrollments and need for faculty come true, what will be the effect on administrative positions? If institutional growth in size and responses to compliance requirements have been major causes of job expansion and specialization in the past, what will happen in the next decade? Can we expect a decline in collegiate administrative opportunity comparable to changes in the student and faculty estates? The NEA and others, such as Froomkin and McCully (1977, p. 52), suggest not. Their data show greater growth in administrative positions than in faculty posts, and that administrative positions are not dropped as rapidly as faculty positions. Their conclusions have the ring of truth to them, and seem to be in line with common expectations. After all, most budget-cutting

exercises are led by administrators, and in these exercises faculty are often looked upon as individual units of specialization whereas administrative departments are considered as systems with necessary components.

It seems to me that planning and managing reductions in scale will be even more nefficient than managing growth. That is, during any retrenchment in anticipation of declining enrollments and reduced resources, faculty positions (the major units of production, if you will) will be the first to be cut. As a result, the ratio of administrators to faculty will actually increase. Why? One reason is that faculty lines are more dynamic; they become vacant on more occasions because of limited term, nontenured appointments. Therefore, cuts can be planned. For this reason, and because administrators are the managers of resources, faculty lines are usually cut first.

The reasons to expect continued growth in administration have been described by many scholars (Baldridge, et al., op. cit., Froomkin and McCully, op. cit.; Minter and Bowen, op. cit.; Kerr, 1972; Perkins, 1973; Bowen, 1977; Mayhew, 1977a). Basically, they argue that because of influences in the external environment and the complex decisions (both technical and political) to be made on campus, presidents and other senior executives will need more help from collegiate middle-managers, the information

finders and analysts. (One might contrast the levels of administration in this way: the lowest level engages in transactions; the middle-level defines and gathers information; and the top level makes decisions.) In other words, growth in administration will be directly related to new institutional challenges. Uncertainty about the environment of higher education will result in new activities and the increasing specialization of organizational components.

Harold Howe II (1977, p. 18) ascribes this complexity to the same "fog that has settled over American society itself." Americans have fewer shared purposes, more contending groups [each with its own arsenal of information], and a less clear understanding of where we are heading. The functions that will encourage growth include the use and maintenance of new technologies, relations with off-campus constituents and other claimants that seem also to necessitate institutional counterparts, the need for human and financial resources, the need to offer services for students, and relations with faculty and other employees. The likely consequences include, in addition to a greater proportion of administrators to faculty--although this will vary by institutional type and control--increased conflict within institutions, and therefore increasingly complex grievance procedures; increased unionization; and greater centralization, as

well as bureaucratization, on campus as well as in society at large (Yarmolinsky, op. cit., pp. 130, 167; Meyer, 1978, p. 79); Argyris, 1979, p. 15). The results will be more rules, regulations, controls, official custodial functions, and layers of supervision.

The categories which will experience growth are those specialties that work most closely with the environment of the institution: the "financial technocrats" (Baldridge, et al., op. cit., p. 208), fund raisers, lawyers, personnel managers, labor negotiators, safety officials, institutional researchers, and management information specialists. The specialized functions and the specialist will grow in number and in power. Other administrative functions, such as student services, may find some increase in importance, but I doubt that they will increase greatly in either size or power.

There is, of course, some possibility that administrative growth will not continue. Certainly if faculty dominance of governance bodies expands or if the nature of collegiate institutions changes in some radical way, one might imagine a different future. It does seem that growth in administration is affected by the trends in academic careers and university missions, which are in turn affected by the general economy and the funding of research and service activities. And it is possible that

management and planning activities will not take hold in universities; after all, there is some doubt about their success in business (Cyert, 1975, p. 6; Wrapp, op. cit.). Nevertheless, I agree with Talcott Parsons who argues that, on the whole, organizational forms in higher education are so firmly institutionalized that their patterns are unlikely to change profoundly and that the forces of differentiation and specialization of positions will continue (Parsons, 1978, p. 112). The basic organizational unit is the professor, the next is the research group or the department. And these will continue.

Another force to limit change is the national occupational association, which encourages standardization of position descriptions and office procedures. Since these associations are often dominated by officials from older, large institutions, which are least likely to change in basic administrative form, the professional identities of registrars, business officers, and other officials take on the stamp of the dominant group in the association, and develop resistance to organizational reform.

These companion facts about faculty and administrators--these organizational valences--will tend to limit structural changes.

Unfortunately, there are no projections of administrative employment, only extrapolations to be made from

historical and projected data about student enrollment, faculty positions, and current fund expenditures on administration and general expenses. Such extrapolations are not reliable, but they are suggestive; and when coupled with an examination of other issues and trends, they can help project employment opportunities in a general way. This is an area in need of systematic study. In fact, the entire area of collegiate middle-management deserves further examination.

I think we will see in the 1980's an increased emphasis on administration, but with some new problems and dimensions. First, I think the major change will be in the source of administrators. As institutions close ranks to evaluate and protect themselves; as faculty concern for the uncertainty in the external environment, and for finances, positions, and administrative growth increases; and as lessened student demand leaves both tenured faculty and young Ph.D.'s without classes to teach, there will be a heightened awareness and desire by faculty to employ other faculty in administrative positions. This tendency may be helped along if salaries in higher education fail to keep pace and the various specialists needed by institutions go instead into industry, private practice, or government work.

For many years, the major sources of administrators were recent alumni and mid-career transfers from other segments of the economy (Bess and Lodahl, 1969; Scott, 1978). I predict that this pattern will change and that the oversupply of Ph.D.'s (Monthly Labor Review, October 1978, pp. 48-50), young faculty who fail to gain tenure, and older faculty who lack students because of lower enrollment will become the new sources of middle-level administrators. I believe that this change to an earlier pattern will take place both for financial reasons, i.e., one way to make use of faculty without students is to give them an administrative duty that needs doing, and for reasons of value, i.e., faculty will want as administrators those who at least appear to share values in common. (See Ripley, 1979, p.8. See also Cyert and March, 1963, who argue that as environmental uncertainty increases, system members undertake more boundary-spanning activity to gather and process information, and thereby try to reduce uncertainty).

While this change will probably take place first in the least technical areas, such as in student services and in the staffing of committees, it is not unreasonable to expect new efforts to make possible the training of faculty for more specialized administrative functions. There is now a program to train young humanists for business; why not a similar program for university administrative posts? ("Philosophy to Profits").

Nevertheless, the structural and environmental limits to collegiate middle-management careers will continue. This is almost inevitable given the mixed organizational character of colleges and universities and the influence of faculty on the selection of senior officers.

In the mixed organizational form, which includes bureaucratic, collegial, and political elements, each segment has its own career patterns or ladders (See Scott, 1978, p. 10.). For an interesting discussion of dual-career ladders, see Goldner and Ritti, 1967, pp. 489-502).

Rosabeth Moss Kanter has written cogently about the "opportunity problem" in higher education; about the fact that low growth and relatively horizontal organizations offer few opportunities for advancement (1978b). The issues of career paths and mobility are also examined thoroughly in Lords, Squires, and Yeomen. In this essay, I would like to comment first on the matters of job motivation, satisfaction, and compensation, and then on the issues of job status and professional standing.

I have found several reasons to be concerned about the nature of middle-level collegiate positions. That these positions are important has been noted; that job incumbents want to be involved, valued, and rewarded has become a commonplace; that satisfaction in work is related to job performance is often cited. But how can we ensure

that jobs remain satisfying and performance remains high when there are few opportunities for professional growth in collegiate administration? How can we keep staff members emotionally involved in their institution's aims when they do similar work year after year? If jobs are a source of meaning and of pride (Kanter, 1978a, pp.55-60) and if career advancement and self-identity are intertwined (London, 1978, p. 29), how can we enhance individual self-esteem in an organization that offers limited mobility?

It is not uncommon when interviewing collegiate middle-managers to find a director of an office who has served for twenty years or more in the same position, during which time his office's responsibilities have grown and expanded. In similar fashion, the whole administrative organization of the college became more complex and added administrative layers. This longevity of office directors can serve to retard even further the already limited internal mobility of junior officers in the relatively flat organizational structures of colleges (Scott, 1978).

One issue brought to mind by this finding of longevity is that of job satisfaction. Most jobs can seem interesting at first, but then a dilemma of competing values emerges. Organizations want stability (Argyris,

1972, p. 7); incumbents want to use their skills fully in challenging new experiences and in positions of higher status (Bisconti and Solmon, 1977, p. 26). However, stability requires that tasks become routine, and routine can result in repetitive, boring work. For someone in a middle-level position with little hope of achieving the American expectation for advancement, the routines of work can become a greater influence than the occasional requirements to solve a new problem (See Cooper, Morgan, Foley, and Kaplan, 1979). And now, with the prospects of even longer work lives, this issue takes on greater urgency. For not only does this mean potentially more years of boredom, but also more points in time for evaluation and training.

While we are not certain about the correlation of job satisfaction to productivity among the better educated, many scholars argue that there are strong relationships between job opportunities, aspirations, self-esteem, and morale, that these are related to work alienation (Kanter, 1978a, pp. 53, 54, 62), and that this is associated with productivity (Kanter, 1979, p. E 17; Elliot Richardson, 1976, p. 242).

What incentives can be offered that would meet both the motivational needs of people and the productive needs of the organization? When one asks collegiate middle-

managers about incentives that should be offered, high on the list are inhouse mobility, both vertical and horizontal, job rotation, task force assignments, performance evaluation, and institutional support for staff development programs (Scott, 1978).

Improvements in performance result from a combination of motives or personal desires and incentives (from within and from without) with a steady application of reinforcement, which can lead to feelings of self-esteem, satisfaction, and mastery (Bucher and Stelling, 1977). The result desired is an effective and satisfied administrator, one who can contribute to the effectiveness of the organization through goal formulation, goal attainment, resource acquisition, and membership satisfaction (Genova et al., 1976). According to Harlan Cleveland, the effective administrator is one who can deal with ambiguity, achieve consensus, possess a "can do" spirit unwarranted by expert predictions, and has a willingness to take initiative and let others take the credit (1977, pp. 23, 24).

Many incentive schemes cited in the literature pay homage to A. H. Maslow and his theory of self-actualization. Unfortunately, such schemes often become organized around the "hierarchy of need stages" proclaimed and fail to recognize that the fullest development of personal possibilities is a continuum with a constantly receding end

point. New "value clusters"--first job security, then individual rights at work, etc.--constantly arise (Kanter 1978b, p. 4; Westin, 1978, p. 18F). Most incentives mentioned also assume or require an organizational environment that values initiative instead of sycophancy (Tierney, 1979), and supports the notion of organizational development through personnel development (R. Richardson, 1975).

But institutions have not shown support for this notion. Most campus training programs are for clerical employees. While major off-campus programs are designed for executive-level staff, they are expensive and time-consuming; consequently few middle-managers attend. Instead, they participate in workshops sponsored by their associations (Scott, 1978). And those sponsored by institutional associations for carefully selected faculty chosen for senior administrative positions may be as much "prestige-conferring" as actually helpful in training for specific skills (Kanter and Wheatley, n.d.; Baumgartel, 1976).

While salary levels have been discussed elsewhere, it should be said in this context that compensation is another aspect of job opportunity that is severely limited (Bowen, 1978). A likely consequence of the complex of forces discussed heretofore is that the most ambitious

of administrators will look outside of higher education for employment, that college administrators will be selected because they are available, not because they are best, and that institutions will suffer from poor administration. It seems to me that there are severe consequences in this for both institutions and individuals.

The consequences for institutions have been discussed by Bowen (ibid.). If opportunities, salaries, and status are not improved, it will become difficult for institutions to recruit and retain highly skilled administrators. Colleges will have to rely heavily on the less ambitious who in Kanter's terms are "stuck" (1979), and on faculty who shift to administration from teaching. Also, with large numbers of faculty and recent Ph.D.'s available, an inflation of required credentials may occur, which could result in overeducation and underemployment (Kanter, 1978a, p. 64; Ochsner and Solmon, 1979, p. 41). The results for individuals may not be so obvious, but certainly a loss of self-esteem is among them. For in our society self-respect comes largely through the act of working (Kanter, ibid.).

This equation of satisfying work and self-esteem is affected in colleges by the nature of their status structure. On campus, faculty, especially tenured faculty,

have the highest prestige and more influence than virtually all administrators (Parsons and Platt, op. cit., p. 136). In fact, one can present a good case that administrative positions have been created to do the duties cast off by a faculty spread thin by commitments. As the faculty role has taken on responsibilities for research, public service, consulting, and campus governance in addition to teaching, duties in admissions, registration, and the like have been assigned to new support positions. These new people are asked to perform duties associated with faculty roles but without the same degree of formal responsibility or the same kinds of rewards (ibid., p. 409; Bowen, 1978). The result, according to Parsons and Platt, is a diminution of loyalty and an increase in resentment and alienation on the part of the emergent campus professions (ibid. Leavitt, 1978, p. 158; Scott, 1978).

Perhaps the best place to look first in assessing the relative professional standing of faculty and administrators on campus is at salary levels and annual increases. According to Minter and Bowen (1978) salaries of faculty members in the past two years have almost kept pace with inflation. In another source, Bowen (1978) argues that the "remuneration of administrative officials in colleges and universities moves roughly, but not

exactly, parallel to that for faculty" (p. 22). If in his computations he were also to include associate and assistant deans and directors of support services, the picture would be both more complete and worse. On both dimensions, then, gross salaries and annual increases, middle-level administrator salaries are lower than those for faculty. Another examination, which I believe would result in similar conclusions, would be to compare the levels and ranges in salary classification schedules.

For a thorough discussion of this topic, including comparative salaries, relations with others on campus, and the role of national associations in the professional lives of mid-level administrators, see Lords, Squires, and Yeomen (Scott, 1978).

Now it is obvious that not all middle-managers feel the scorn of faculty. Many, especially academic deans' staff and financial aid officers, have regular contact with both faculty and students. However, there are college administrators who have little or no direct contact with either, and whose primary contact is about contracts and other forms of "business" paperwork. These middle-level administrators differ from others on campus in two significant ways. Not only do they have virtually no involvement with teachers and learners in their primary roles, but also these administrators identify themselves

as professionals comparable to persons doing similar work in both collegiate institutions and industry. Most traditional collegiate middle-manager positions have for frames of reference only similar collegiate positions, which originated in the academy. But the new, fast-growing positions in personnel and finance brought to campuses in response to federal requirements and the need for better financial management--to implement procedures and control activities--have their origins in business and are being populated on campus by persons from industry. They identify not only with a specialized field, but also with an entirely different organizational context and set of values. I believe it is the increasing number and influence of these positions--with the different frames of reference and values--that places renewed strain on faculty-administrative relations.

Collegiate middle-managers also experience a lack of clarity in their role as administrators. Standards, expectations, directions are often confused, as their constituents send conflicting signals to them. Middle-managers are to be servants to students and faculty (to "hold their coats," according to Doris Grumbach, 1978), and instruments of institutional policy set by senior administrators and trustees. They are to be both servants (as support staff) and policemen (as monitors of procedures).

Middle-managers are generally overworked and suffer from inadequate facilities and insufficient staff help (Thomas, 1978, p. 18). They have, indeed, achieved only "grudging acceptance" (Perkins, op. cit., p. 8).

Such role conflicts can result in "no-risk" actions and self-defeating behavior. When in formal relations with faculty, even the most expert of middle-managers can find himself in the position of "go for." Such relations can force administrators into a limited and caricatured, obsequious role, in which they are likely to be ineffectual and stumble, which contributes to the lack of respect between faculty and administrators (Thomas, ibid., p. 18). The result can be an awkward relationship, hardly what is needed for the accomplishment of common goals. But that is the rub. Unlike a corporation, which has profit as a superordinate goal, educational institutions have a variety of goals, with none universally acclaimed. One learns to tolerate ambiguity, or become ineffective. And the feeling of powerlessness tends to encourage middle-managers to become rules-minded and defensive about their domain. This reaction, of course, is not unique to higher education (Kanter, 1977).

Conflicts in occupational roles--e.g., when one is charged both to serve and to control--can undermine administrative effectiveness and encourage the transfer of

energy from one's institution to other agencies. Weak salaries and advancement opportunities, and a decline in status, at a time when specialized demands are increasing, are serious agents of conflict. They affect one's feelings of identity as a professional, commitment to one's work, and loyalty to one's organization (Bucher and Stelling, op. cit.). The total effects of such dysfunction are difficult to determine, but it seems certain that without loyalty to institutional aspirations, administrators will be less than fully attentive and effective when conflicts in occupational role and loyalty exist.

Expectations, of course, are higher than this. While most managers and professionals never harbor the illusion of membership in the top councils of the establishment, or put such a dream aside early in their careers, they do expect advancement up the ladder of success in our increasingly large, multilayered, bureaucratic institutions with expanding opportunities for administrators and managers (Kanter, 1978b, p. 63; Cooper, et al., op. cit.; Ginzberg, 1979). By education and experience, and the encouragement of Washington-based associations, collegiate administrators expect satisfying career opportunities. But even with the adaptation of faculty ideologies (Dibble, 1962, pp. 229-241) and the orientation toward service, conflicts exist and expectations languish. There is, simply and

tragically, a lack of validation for the importance of the middle-manager's role. On more than one campus I visited, admissions officers had not been invited to the president's fall or spring receptions, and mid-level administrators considered experts with specialized information off campus were often ignored on their home campus (Scott, 1978; Thomas, op. cit.).

But, these conclusions notwithstanding, there is hope. Like many of the collegiate middle-managers interviewed, I am optimistic. They are optimistic, by the way, not because they believe conditions will improve, but that they will get better and rise to meet the new needs. These are the reinsmen on whom higher education must rely.

College and university administrators of all ranks, but especially presidents, must decide whether their terms of office will be characterized by institutional paralysis or by thoughtful initiatives. An organization's climate, after all, is in large measure a function of the behavior of its top-level members and the procedures they institute (Scott, 1979). Paralysis will result from a gradually more bureaucratic, robot-like administration. Thoughtful initiatives will be possible only if the president and those in his shadow have a vision and act with purpose, like the reinsmen who travelled the Santa Fe trail. But, you ask, will it be possible? What can we expect for and from collegiate middle-management?

The social forces mentioned earlier will of course affect the future directions of collegiate institutions both as educational enterprises and as employers. As Clark Kerr has said, "Higher education is tenured in by its faculty and walled in by its physical plant for the next quarter century. [The physical plant alone is a $70 billion barrier to many institutional changes (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1977-78, p. 138).] A new period of comparative flexibility and freedom of choice will . . ." not arrive for two and one-half decades (1977, p. 41).

Given these limitations--and the probable failure to develop a new purpose--the form, processes, and practices of higher education will probably not change appreciably in the foreseeable future (Mayhew, 1977b, p. 49). We know its heritage, and can forecast that only "minimal adaptation to evolving environments" will have to be made (Kerr, 1977, p. 39).

Nevertheless, there will be changes in collegiate administration. New clientele will require new services and new public policies and patterns of attendance may lead us to expect a "reduction in such services as the health center, counselling clinic, campus dining rooms, and elaborate programs of recreation" (Mayhew, ibid., p. 50). However, this decline in student services,

except perhaps in the career-planning office and a few others, will be offset by changing styles of management and a growing bureaucracy in other support areas.

There is a great diffusion, and some confusion, of authority on many campuses. Students, faculty, governing boards, and governmental agencies are increasingly involved in questions of authority and management (Ness, 1977, 136). Concomitantly, there is a growing tendency toward bureaucratization, in part as a necessary response to external demands for accountability (Bonham, 1977, pp. 160 and 162; Newman, 1977, p. 126; Scott, 1979). The result will be increased costs in numerous categories of expense, which by itself may require more staff (Millett, 1977, pp. 69 and 70; Scott, ibid.).

A major influence on this rise in the extent and cost of administration is the tendency toward a centralization of the authority to set objectives and to evaluate efforts. This occurs because questions of survival are institutional questions, not individual faculty or department matters alone (Bonham, ibid., p. 165).

In the past, virtually all major changes came about as a result of external and quite unpredictable factors such as an upsurge in the birth rate, war, and post-war economic and political developments; the sudden preoccupation with research in the 1940's; concern about the

barriers to educational opportunity; and, finally, demands for expanded access in the 1960's (Mayhew, 1977b, pp. 45 and 46.) Each of these changes had important effects on the size and complexity, and, therefore, on the administrative structures of postsecondary institutions. The future holds more of the same.

The effects of these forces will be continued demands on the senior officers and governing bodies of institutions, and an increasing need for administrative help. Therefore, I conclude that institutions, in the persons of the president and trustees, must take responsibility for the condition of staff, as well as for faculty. Colleges and universities must think of themselves as employers as well as educators.

In Lords, Squires, and Yeomen, I enumerate sets of recommendations for presidents and collegiate middle-managers to follow. Therefore, in this paper I will emphasize only a few ideas. First, since university administration looks bureaucratic and therefore encourages the expectation of advancement, and since a basic work motivation in bureaucracies is the opportunity for advancement, frustration results when advancement opportunities are limited. However, according to Cooper, et al. (op. cit.), frustration is not as likely to result when the structure of opportunities is known. Therefore, colleges and universities should become the pacemakers in developing new

models of mobility and advancement. Organizations should, and can, be flexible, and give as much attention to the talents and interests of gifted staff as to the functions that need to be carried out. But, whether in new or in traditional organizational structures, institutional leaders must be sensitive to their staffs. Workers at all levels, in order to be productive and satisfied, must feel that their jobs are valued, that they can exercise a variety of skills in their work and have responsibility for the results, and that they can see how their work fits into the whole of the operation and will be told how well they are doing (Bess, 1978).

This is in some sense an ideal for which to aim. But much can be done while striving for it.

There are already many opportunities for self-fulfilling, challenging work if one takes the initiative. If one is a reinsman, alert to new paths and new equipment, uses them wisely in achieving the goals before him, and develops the self-confidence needed to deal with the unexpected, both job opportunities and satisfactions are possible.

On the trail, the reinsman was his own authority; he made the best judgments he could in the interests of his company, his horses, and his passengers. His reflexes had to be fast and sure. He took advantage of the independence of action he had. He, and not the robot of narrow view, is a fine model for collegiate administrators to follow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, Chris. "A Few Words in Advance." In The Failure of Success, edited by Alfred J. Marrow. New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1972.

--- "Organizational Intervention: A Merger of Theory and Action." Review of Higher Education, Volume 2, No. 2, Winter 1979, p. 15.

Baldridge, J. Victor, David V. Curtis, George Ecker, and Gary L. Riley. Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Baumgartel, Howard. "Evaluation of Management Development Efforts in the University Setting: Problems, Programmes, and Research Model." New Frontiers in Education--Delhi, 1976, pp. 23, 32, 33.

Bess, James, and Thomas M. Lodahl. "Career Patterns and Satisfactions in University Middle-Management." Educational Record, volume 50, Spring 1969, pp. 220-229.

Bess, James, "Incentives for Improving Administrative Competence and Performance." A Response to a Paper by Robert A. Scott, presented to the National Assembly of The American Association of University Administrators, Chicago, 1978.

Bisconti, Ann Stouffer, and Lewis C. Solmon. Job Satisfaction after College--The Graduates Viewpoint. The CPC Foundation, Bethlehem, Pa., 1977.

Bonham, George W. "Who Runs the Show?," in The Third Century. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977, pp. 158ff.

Bowen, Howard R. "Systems Theory, Excellence, and Values: Will They Mix?" Paper presented at Discussion Group 27, 31st National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by AAHE, Chicago, Monday, March 8, 1976, p. 6.

--- Investment in Learning. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.

--- Academic Compensation. TIAA/CREF, 1978.

Bucher, Rue, and Joan G. Stelling. Becoming Professional. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.

Chronicle of Higher Education, July 11, 1977, p. 7.

Cleveland, Harlan. "The Education of Administrators for Higher Education." Fourth David D. Henry Lecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, April 13-14, 1977.

Cooper, M. R., B. S. Morgan, P. M. Foley, and L. B. Kaplan. "Changing Employee Values: A Deepening Discontent." Harvard Business Review, Jan.-Feb. 1979, pp. 117-125.

Cyert, Richard M. The Management of Nonprofit Organizations. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1975.

Cyert, Richard, and James G. March. A Behavioral Theory of the Firm. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Dibble, Vernon K. "Occupations and Ideologies." The American Journal of Sociology, volume 68, 1962, pp. 229-241.

Digest of Educational Statistics, 1977-78.

Froomkin, Joseph, and Clinton McCully. A Review of Financial Developments in Higher Education, 1970/71-1974/75, and a Prognosis for 1980-1985. Joseph Froomkin, Inc., Washington, D.C., February 1977.

Genova, William J., Marjorie K. Madoff, and George B. Thomas. Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976.

Ginzberg, Eli. "The Professionalization of the U. S. Labor Force." Scientific American, Volume 240, No. 3, March 1979.

Glenny, Lyman A. "The Anonymous Leaders of Higher Education." The Journal of Higher Education, Volume 43, January 1972, pp. 9-22.

Goldner, Fred H., and R. R. Ritti. "Professionalization as Career Immobility," The American Journal of Sociology, Volume 72, No. 5, March 1967, pp. 489-502.

Grumbach, Doris. "Searching for the Genuine Seekers." The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 20, 1978, p. 29.

Howe, Harold, II. "The President's Role," in Leadership for Higher Education: The Campus View, edited by Roger W. Heyns. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977, p. 18ff.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977.

--- "Working in a New America," in A New America? Daedalus, Volume 107, No. 1, Winter 1978a, pp. 47.

--- "The Opportunity Problem." AAHE Bulletin, June 1978b.

--- "Ungluing the Stuck." The New York Times, January 28, 1979, p. E. 17.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, and Margaret J. Wheatley. "Career Development for Women in Academic Administration: The Role of Training." Summary of Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York, n.d.

Kerr, Clark. "The Administration of Higher Education in an Era of Change and Conflict." First David D. Henry Lecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, October 10-11, 1972.

--- "En Attendant 2000," in The Third Century. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977, pp. 39ff.

Ladd, Everett Carll, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset. The Divided Academy, Professors and Politics. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1975.

Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. Fourth Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978, p. 158.

Linney, Thomas J. "Alternatives to Tenure." Research Currents, March 1979.

London, Howard B. The Culture of A Community College. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Legacy of the Seventies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977a.

--- "Lessening Influence and the Search for Purpose," in The Third Century. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977b, pp. 44ff.

Meyer, Marshall, and Associates. Environments and Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Millett, John D. "Money and Other Trifles," in The Third Century. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977, pp. 64ff.

Minter, W. John, and Howard R. Bowen. Independent Higher Education. Fourth Annual Report on Financial and Educational Trends in the Independent Sector of American Higher Education. National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1978.

Monthly Labor Review, October 1978, pp. 48-50.

Mortimer, Kenneth, and T. R. McConnell. Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Mosher, Edith K., and Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr., editors. The Changing Politics of Education: Prospects for the 1980's. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1978.

Ness, Frederic W. "Consensus and Preservation," in The Third Century. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977, pp. 135ff.

Newman, Frank. "Taking the Helm," in The Third Century. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977, pp. 116ff.

Ochsner, Nancy L., and Lewis C. Solmon. "Forecasting the Labor Market for Highly Educated Workers." Review of Higher Education, Vol. 2, No. 2., Winter 1979, pp. 34-46.

Parsons, Talcott, and Gerald Platt, with Neil J. Smelser. The American University. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Parsons, Talcott. Action Theory and The Human Condition. New York: The Free Press, 1978.

Perkins, James A., editor. The University as an Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

"Philosophy to Profits, Clear Thinking's the Key." Inside Education, March 1979, pp. 9, 12. Published by the New York State Education Department.

Reinhold, Robert. "50% Rise in World Population Forecast by Year 2000." The New York Times, February 26, 1979, p. D9.

Richardson, Elliot. The Creative Balance. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Staff Development: A Conceptual Framework." Journal of Higher Education, Volume 46, May/June 1975, pp. 303-312.

Riley, Gary L., and J. Victor Baldridge. Governing Academic Organizations. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1977.

Ripley, S. Dillon. "The View from the Castle." Winter, 1979, p. 8.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vantage Books, 1962.

Scott, Robert A. Lords, Squires and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle-Managers and Their Organizations. ERIC/AAHE, No. 7, 1978.

---, in Derek Bok, et al. In the Public Interest: Government and the Future of the Academy. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1979.

Tierney, Michael L. "The Organizational Climate of Private College Administrators: A Description." Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, April 10, 1979.

Thomas, Gerald S. Organizational Commitment: Sources and Implications for the Development of Middle Managers. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1978.

Westin, Alan F. "A New Move Toward Employee Rights." The New York Times, April 23, 1978. p. 18F.

Wrapp, H. Edward. "A Plague of Professional Managers." The New York Times, April 8, 1979, p. 16F.

Yarmolinsky, Adam. "What Future for the Professional in American Society?" in A New America?, Daedalus, Volume 107, No. 1, Winter 1978, pp. 159ff.